

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/582,787	06/13/2006	Masato Kaneda	Q79148	5976	
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 12/30/200 ION PLLC	EXAM	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			EOFF,	EOFF, ANCA	
SUITE 800 WASHINGTO	N DC 20037	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
······································	., 50 2005	1795			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/30/2009	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/582,787	KANEDA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
ANCA EOFF	1795	
	10/582,787 Examiner	10/582,787 KANEDA ET AL.  Examiner Art Unit

	ANCA EOFF	1795	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 14 December 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>Al The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date			
<ul> <li>The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is</li> </ul>	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i	n).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the property of the property of the property of the Notice of Appeal has been filed.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> </ol>			cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		_ = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =	
<ul> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	ter form for appeal by materially red	lucing or simplifying t	he issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all</li> </ol>		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).  7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☑ wil	be entered and an e	xplanation of
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 3.6.12.14.16 and 18.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13. Other:			
/Cynthia H Kelly/	/Anca Eoff/		

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795

Examiner, Art Unit 1795

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On pages 2.3 of the Remarks, the applicant argues the rejection over Koyanagie tad, IWO 03/072634) in view of Wytet et al. (US Pg-Pu-Du 2003/0118946). The applicant argues that Koyanagi et al. teach tetramethyl benzene in a developer and Wyatt et al. teach discopropybenzene in a developer but do not teach that tetramethyle-nezene and discopropybenzene have the same properties. The applicant further argues that it wont on the valve or obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use tetramethylbenzene in an amount of 20% by mass in a developer, based on the teaching that discopropybenzene in present in an amount of 20% by mass in a developer.

The examiner would like to show that Koyanagi et al. teach the use of tetramethylbenzene in a developer for photosensitive composition and tetramethylbenzene is an aromatic hydrocarbon. Wyatt et al. teach a developer for photosensitive printing plates, wherein said developer may comprise 20% by mass of an aromatic hydrocarbon (see Example 4 in table 1, par.0062). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use an aromatic hydrocarbon in an amount of 20% by mass in a developer.

The rejection of claims 3.13.16 and 17 under 35 USC 103(a) over Koyanagi et al. (WO 03/072634) in view of Wyatt et al. (US Pg-Pub 2003/0118946) is maintained.